	K488LIMC	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	v. 19 Cr. 651 (LTS)	
5	NIKOLAOS LIMBERATOS,	
6	Defendant. Telephone Conference	
7	x	
8	New York, N.Y. April 8, 2020	
9	2:30 p.m.	
10	Before:	
11	HON. LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN,	
12	District Judge	
13	APPEARANCES	
14	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN,	
15	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
16	ROBERT SOBELMAN SAMUEL P. ROTHSCHILD	
17	Assistant United States Attorneys	
18	KARLOFF C. COMMISSIONG Attorney for Defendant	
19	Accorney for Defendant	
20		
21	ALSO PRESENT: LEA HARMON, Pretrial Services	
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 (The Court and all parties appearing telephonically) (Case called) 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 3 4 First, I would like to confirm that the court 5 reporter, Ms. Giniger, is on the line. 6 THE REPORTER: Yes, I am. 7 THE COURT: Now, would the assistant United States attorneys state their appearances, please. 8 9 MR. SOBELMAN: Robert Sobelman for the United States. 10 I am joined on this call by Samuel Rothschild, another 11 assistant US attorney in our office, and Taylor Tescher, an 12 intern in our office. Good afternoon, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Messrs. Sobelman and 14 Rothschild. 15 And Ms. Tescher, I believe it is. Good afternoon. Would defense counsel please state his appearance. 16 17 MR. COMMISSIONG: On behalf of Mr. Limberatos, Karloff 18 Commissiong. Good afternoon, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Commissiong. 20 And would the pretrial services officer please state 21 her appearance. 22 MS. HARMON: Good afternoon, your Honor. Lea Harmon. 23 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Harmon. 24 Is anyone else other than court personnel on the line? 25 All right. I would just ask that all participants

mute when you don't expect to be speaking for a period of time.

And I remind everyone that neither recording nor retransmission of this proceeding is permitted.

A bit about logistics. I will be calling on each speaker during the proceeding. When I do, please identify yourself by name for clarity of the record. And please don't interrupt each other or me during the conference. If we interrupt each other, it's difficult to create an accurate transcript of these proceedings. Having said that, I apologize in advance because I may interrupt when I have questions, and thank you for bearing with that. I will give each of the attorneys an opportunity to make additional comments or ask questions at the end of the proceeding. If anyone has any difficulty hearing me or another participant, please let me know right away.

We are in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. I am conducting this application for bail review and/or temporary release telephonically pursuant to the authority provided by Section 15002 of the CARES Act and the standing orders issued by our chief judge pursuant to that act. Videoconferencing is not reasonably available for today's proceeding.

Counsel are appearing by telephone and Mr. Limberatos is not here and is not participating. Mr. Commissiong filed docket entry number 229 yesterday, a letter in which he states that Mr. Limberatos consents to the telephonic proceeding and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

waives his personal appearance.

Mr. Commissiong, would you please give us a little bit more context by way of explanation of what you discussed with Mr. Limberatos in terms of his rights and the basis of your understanding as to whether his consent is knowing and voluntary and whether it would have been feasible to get that consent in writing from him.

MR. COMMISSIONG: Yes, your Honor, certainly.

I had a conversation with Mr. Limberatos yesterday afternoon. He was released, as everyone is aware. The MCC is currently on a two-week lockdown. Mr. Limberatos was released with three or four other inmates briefly in order to make a phone call from the counselor's office, and during that phone call I explained to him that the hearing in which I put forth the bail application was going to be heard, was scheduled to be heard today. I explained to him that it was scheduled to take place telephonically and that I needed his consent in order to have the proceeding take place telephonically, and I also needed his consent -- and I attempted to explain in the simplest way possible. I explained to him that I needed his consent so that he wouldn't need to appear, because logistically it's just not feasible for him to appear at this proceeding. He explained that he understood and that he consented to both not being present at the hearing and having the proceeding occur telephonically.

K488LTMC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: So are you persuaded that he did understand and that his consent is knowing and voluntary? MR. COMMISSIONG: Absolutely.

THE COURT: I find based on Mr. Commissiong's explanation and representation that Mr. Limberatos's waiver is knowing and voluntary, and that in light of the circumstances at the MCC, the telephonic communication was the feasible way of obtaining that indication of consent and written consent was not feasible in the circumstances.

Thank you, Mr. Commissiong.

Mr. Limberatos is currently detained pursuant to the Court's October 25, 2019 order, and he seeks reopening of that detention hearing and release on conditions under Section 3142(f) of Title 18 or temporary release on conditions under Section 3142(i) of Title 18.

I have received and reviewed the pretrial services report, which is dated October 10, 2019; the submissions from defense counsel, dated March 27, 2020, April 2, 2020, and April 7, 2020; and the government's submission, dated April 1, 2020.

Are there any other written submissions that the parties intend me to have considered in connection with this proceeding?

> No, your Honor. MR. SOBELMAN:

MR. COMMISSIONG: Nothing for the defense, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So at this point, Mr. Commissiong, I would invite you to make your application for reopening and for temporary release.

MR. COMMISSIONG: Thank you, your Honor.

I think that everything that I wanted to communicate to the Court regarding this issue I have detailed in both submissions, but I would like the Court to focus on just a couple of things.

First, I would like the Court to focus on the unsanitary conditions in MCC and in BOP facilities in general. During normal times, the pre-coronavirus period, conditions at the MCC, MDC, other BOP facilities are, at best, unsanitary, for lack of a better word. Those unsanitary conditions, combined with the lack of space, combined with the number of individuals at the MCC, make this a Petri dish for the spread of the coronavirus; it makes it a Petri dish for the spread of the disease COVID-19.

Since the lockdown that has occurred in connection with one or a few of the individuals testing positive at MCC, inmates at MCC have been quarantined to their cells with their bunkmates, because there are two individuals to a cell, and recently they were released in their tiers. Mr. Limberatos explained to me that when the individuals go out to their tiers, it's sort of business as usual, so to speak, people move around like they would during normal times, which would aid in

transmission of COVID-19 if someone would have it. But we don't know who has it and who doesn't many times because the disease spreads among people who are asymptomatic.

I would like the Court to focus on the fact that the BOP is not actively testing people. They may be taking people's temperatures, people who appear symptomatic, but they are not actively testing members of the population; they are not actively testing inmates. And if we don't test, we don't know; if we don't test, we can't know, your Honor, who has the disease and who doesn't.

So, essentially, BOP staff are waiting for people to cough, are waiting for people to complain of chest pain, are waiting for people to have fevers. They are waiting for people to become symptomatic before they quarantine individuals, before they send people out to get tested. And when they bring those individuals back, in many instances they are putting them in the same unit they came from until those test results arrive. And I think I put in my most recent submission that that was done with at least one or two individuals in 11 South, which is directly across from 11 North where Mr. Limberatos is, the unit Mr. Limberatos is in.

I would like the Court to also focus on the difficulty that I had in contacting -- and this goes to the Sixth

Amendment issue that I raised. I would like the Court to focus on the difficulty that I had in arranging a phone call with Mr.

Limberatos, and it was a brief phone call, and it could only be a brief phone call because there were other people waiting on line for the phone at the counselor's office. There were at least two e-mails in connection with your Honor's order sent to MCC Legal in order to schedule a phone call with Mr.

Limberatos, AUSA Sobelman sent an e-mail communicating with MCC Legal, and MCC Legal never contacted me in connection with scheduling a call.

In terms of being able to discuss this case, at the very least talking about discovery that I have seen, discovery that he has seen, these logistics make it impossible to prepare any kind of defense. And while there is no trial scheduled or no hearing scheduled, it makes it inordinately difficult to schedule a hearing, it makes it inordinately difficult to schedule a trial; it makes it difficult to prepare a defense.

The fact that inmates are on a lockdown and they don't know when they will be released, and when they are released they are released for only a brief period of time, either to go on computers that we don't believe are wiped clean in any way, or go on phones that we don't believe are wiped clean in any way, or to take a shower that everyone in the tier — one shower or two showers that everyone in the tier has to use, they are released for a brief period of time, and that's not enough time to review discovery, your Honor. Logistically, these circumstances will prevent or hinder Mr. Limberatos's

Sixth Amendment rights. It will prevent us from preparing an adequate defense.

I will also sort of segue back into the conditions in the BOP. If inmates are being released every three days, or every four days, while in lockdown, they are being released into a common area in the tier, then the purpose of the quarantine in the first place is sort of thwarted. Because, again, you don't know whether the people showing no symptoms are actually people who are infected by the virus but are asymptomatic, and you don't know whether they are spreading it in the common area, you don't know whether they are spreading it in the lounge areas, you don't know whether they are spreading it in the shower. You just don't know. It makes the conditions at the MCC precarious.

And again, Mr. Limberatos is 54 years old, and while the government pointed out in their submission that the CDC says individuals, in terms of age, individuals 65 are more susceptible to severe illness, the New York City Health Department, I pointed out, states that people over 50 are susceptible to severe illness. And while those are contradictory statements, I would stress that we are in an era where information is developing on a daily basis, on an hourly basis, research is continuing as we speak, and we have got to go on the best knowledge that we have; and if the New York City Health Department feels confident enough to put out that people

over 50 have to take extra precautions and people over 50 are susceptible to severe illness, I think that that is something that we have to pay attention to when deciding this issue.

Just as a matter of logistics, should your Honor temporarily release him, or release him for the extent of the pretrial period, he would either be staying with the mother of his children, Ms. Flora Perrada, at 25 Wellington Avenue, Deer Park, New York 11729, or at a house owned by his brother, Athanasios Lymberatos. Lymberatos is spelled with a "Y" with respect to his brother's name. The address is 29-44 164th Street, Flushing, New York -- I'm sorry, your Honor, I just gave you the wrong address where he would be staying. It's 46-34 202nd Street, Bayside, New York 11361. And he would be staying at that address with his niece, his brother's daughter, Angeliki Lymberatos.

I have nothing further at this moment, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you.

I will turn to Mr. Sobelman for his remarks, please.
MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor.

I will be brief because I think we responded to most of these points in our detailed letter. But, of course, we are able to answer any questions the Court may have after I conclude.

To respond to Mr. Commissiong, with respect to his claims about testing or sanitary conditions, we don't think the

Court needs to do a detailed examination of whether, for example, keyboards are being cleaned. Mr. Commissiong is speculating. These are some things that were not in his submission. We can't on the spot confirm whether particular steps are being taken, although we are certain that the BOP with the resources they have are doing everything they can to protect the inmates that are in their care, and we have laid out in our letter the various steps that have been taken by the BOP, both at the MCC specifically and more generally.

I will note that the testing regime that Mr.

Commissiong describes, assuming it's true, is the same for individuals not in a prison setting, which is it is unusual or not permitted, as far as we understand it, at this point, given the limited number of tests, for individuals who are not symptomatic to be tested for COVID-19.

I will briefly address the Sixth Amendment allegations. I want to note that it is the government's understanding, and the Court may be aware of this, that the court is working with both the MCC and the MDC in order to create a system which should be coming online fairly soon by which the court will be able to have proceedings by videoconference with the detained individuals, probably in the mornings, and then in the afternoons there will be access for the inmates to have calls with counsel or similar contacts that they need in order to make sure they are prepared for any

proceedings that might be coming up or other litigation-related conversations that need to happen.

The government's understanding is that the MCC specifically is actually receiving an influx of additional staff today from another facility so that they can make sure they are meeting the demands specifically related to contact with counsel because they have recognized that it's been difficult over the last week or two to make sure there are sufficient staff to accompany inmates from their cells to the locations where legal calls can be made.

These are unusual times where BOP and the rest of us are facing extraordinary challenges. There is no indication that BOP and MCC are not working diligently to make sure that they are providing for the inmates that they have. Things are not perfect right now, and we don't contend otherwise, but it is difficult to see how a couple of weeks of limited communication between Mr. Limberatos and his counsel in this particular case, given the timeline, meaningfully infringes on any right he may have, although, of course, the government would prefer that he has open access to his attorney.

I would note that there are a couple of things that I think the defense has taken no issue with, which is Mr.

Limberatos is not similarly situated to the other cases that he identified in his opening filing. We drew out some of the distinguishing factors, for example, with the *Stephens* case,

the Hudson case, the Doran Santiago Reyes case. Of course, every bail determination is individualized and each person in each case is different, but to the extent the Court is looking to see what other judges have done in the recent days, we don't see a case similar to this one where a defendant who, in the MCC's view and in the government's view, is not in a high-risk category was released, especially where he is an extraordinary risk of flight.

The government is available to answer any questions the Court may have, and we appreciate the opportunity to address the Court.

THE COURT: Thank you. I would just ask that you elaborate further, if possible, and in any event reiterate clearly for the record, your position as to the significance in connection with risk of flight of Mr. Limberatos's proffer of a waiver of extradition.

MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor. We have addressed this in our letter, but I will explain it briefly on the record now.

THE COURT: You did address it in your letter. You made a general statement in your letter that you have never heard of one of these holding up. If you have anything more to add to that or contextualize that, I would be grateful.

MR. SOBELMAN: Understood, your Honor.

We consulted with the Office of International Affairs,

which is located at Main Justice in Washington, D.C., and they are really the department's experts on these type of issues. And they are not aware of any country in which such a waiver would be considered binding, meaning that it might be a factor that a country took into account when they decide whether to grant or deny extradition, but there are a number of different arguments that would be available to the defendant even if he had signed such a waiver.

So, for example, the government's understanding is that defendants in other cases have been successful in fleeing and then arguing in the jurisdiction to which they have fled, and then the government has sought extradition, to be able to argue, well, I signed it under duress because I wanted to not be in prison in the United States, or the prosecution somehow had a political flavor, a variety of arguments one could imagine, and that a foreign government would decide that indeed it was not knowing and voluntary. And depending on the country, it really does vary country by country, such waivers might not even be considered valid at all, meaning that there are certain countries where extradition essentially is non-waiveable and one has to go through a protocol that is set forth, but there are literally dozens of regimes.

But I can say that we consulted the Office of International Affairs, and their staff is not aware of any country that would consider such a waiver binding; that it

line?

might be a factor that could be considered depending on the country or might not be considered depending on the country, but that it would not be binding, in the sense that as long as Mr. Limberatos signed it now, wherever he went, we could easily get him back if we were to locate him. That is just simply fiction and there are a number of cases that reference that fact.

THE COURT: Do you have any specific information about Greece?

MR. SOBELMAN: I don't, your Honor. We weren't able to get any specific information about Greece. If the Court wishes, we can follow up and attempt to do so. But given the blanket sort of categorical view of the Office of International Affairs that there is no country that would necessarily honor such a waiver, we didn't think it necessary. In addition I will note, as your Honor I am sure recalls from the earlier set of hearings and briefings, Greece is under no obligation to extradite its own citizens to the United States, and we are not aware that this waiver would have any bearing.

THE COURT: One moment.

Ms. Giniger, are you still on the line?

THE REPORTER: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Commissiong, are you still on the

MR. COMMISSIONG: I am still here, your Honor.

II SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS D.C.

THE COURT: It sounds like we have key players. 1 Ms. Harmon, are you still on the line? 2 3 MS. HARMON: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Sobelman, would you continue, please. 5 MR. SOBELMAN: I will simply say if the Court wishes 6 for us to try to obtain additional information, if it exists, 7 with respect to Greece's view on such a waiver, we can do so, although, again, our understanding is that no country would 8 9 find it binding, and in any event, the United States government 10 would never be able to even request extradition of Mr. Limberatos because of Greece's view they do not extradite their 11 12 own citizens pursuant to the terms of the treaty. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. I am not making that request 14 at this point. 15 MR. COMMISSIONG: Pardon me, your Honor? THE COURT: I am not making that request of you at 16 17 this point. 18 MR. COMMISSIONG: I wanted to briefly respond, if your Honor would allow me. 19 20 THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Commissiong. I didn't 21 realize that was your voice. I was just responding to Mr. 22 Sobelman's offer, and I thought he had asked me a question. 23 If you will bear with me for a moment, Mr. 24 Commissiong, I just want to ask Officer Harmon, on behalf of 25 pretrial services, if she wanted to say anything at this point.

MS. HARMON: Your Honor, I don't have anything to add, unless you have any questions for me.

THE COURT: No, I don't, but I wanted to make sure I gave you the opportunity. Thank you.

Mr. Commissiong.

MR. COMMISSIONG: Yes. Your Honor, I wanted to just address a couple of points that the government made.

First, what does flight mean in this case at this particular juncture? If Mr. Limberatos were to flee to Greece, what would he be fleeing to? He would be fleeing from one epicenter of this epidemic to another epicenter of this epidemic, and he at worst would have to travel through a number of countries that all have certain travel restrictions. My understanding is that from March 18 through April 18, non-European Union citizens are barred from entering Greece; transiting travelers, government delegation members, long-term residents and spouses and minor children that are European Union nationals are still permitted entry.

THE COURT: But he is a Greece national, correct?

MR. COMMISSIONG: He is a Greek national.

THE COURT: So they let their own nationals back in?

MR. COMMISSIONG: Well, will they let this particular national back in? I don't know, simply because travel restrictions, based on how the epidemic is moving, are changing daily. The only person that he has in Greece is a 99-year-old

mother. So now, do we believe that Mr. Limberatos would leave
New York while this case is pending to go to Greece to
possibly — travel on a plane, maybe traveling through a number
of countries, to possibly put his 99-year-old mother at risk?

I think that that's a question that we have got to consider.

And in terms of figuring out, well, what does flight mean in
this particular circumstance, do we believe that Mr.

Limberatos, under these circumstances, in this particular case,
as the case stands now, do we believe that he is a serious risk
of flight to the extent that flight means what I just
described?

The government stated that testing at BOP facilities is the same as testing in the general public, but BOP facilities are not the same as the general public. BOP facilities are under the specific control of the federal government, the federal government that has access to tests, the federal government that runs facilities that are particularly susceptible to extensive transmission of the virus. If the government says that through April 30 the public in general should practice social distancing, that there is a recommendation that people should wear masks, and the cramped spaces of the Bureau of Prisons aren't a place where you can social distance really with anyone, the crowded spaces of the BOP, its staff haven't provided gloves or masks to their inmates, then we are looking at a place that, contrary to the

government's assertions, is susceptible, Mr. Limberatos being over 50 is at a higher likelihood of contracting the disease, and if he gets the disease, of dying, your Honor.

The government made some comments regarding additional staff coming in to help field calls from counsel. Additional staff came in to the MCC shortly after Mr. Epstein's suicide. That happened, to my understanding, because of staff shortages prior to his suicide. That staff remained there for just a few weeks, and for a period of from January to about the time MCC locked down because there was a weapon at the facility, the wait times to see your client in person were inordinately long. And that was because that staff couldn't stay for more than a few weeks, on information and belief they couldn't stay for more than a few weeks.

When the lockdown occurred in connection with the firearm, counsel couldn't meet with defendants. There was limited access between the end of that lockdown and the beginning of the March 13 lockdown in connection with the coronavirus. So when the government says that a couple of weeks of limited access won't hurt, well, if you extend it back to the lockdown in connection with the firearm, this is more than a couple of weeks. To say that it's just going to be a couple of weeks, we don't know from day to day how this is going to turn out. And to assume, based on the BOP's record, based on the MCC's record, that it's just going to be a couple

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of weeks, to me, that just doesn't make sense given these circumstances.

I would also add that in terms of unsanitary conditions and me sort of speculating, there has been for years sentencing memoranda upon sentencing memoranda submitted by defense counsel regarding infestation of mice and roaches at the MCC and MDC. I think as recent as November or December, in the women's unit at the MCC, there was flooding; there was flooding and the staff at MCC made the inmates clean up the flooding. Mold grew as a result of the flooding. unsanitary conditions are a fact; they are not speculation. MDC, we know last February there was a small fire that generated a lack of heat and hot water at that facility. unsanitary conditions are not speculation, they are fact. as a defense attorney who goes to these facilities, who has to see clients in these facilities, I have seen corrections officers with their own personal -- during good times -- with their own personal bottle of hand sanitizer. I myself wash my hands right after I leave these facilities. I have seen unsanitary conditions in the bathroom, sometimes in the visiting rooms --

THE COURT: Mr. Commissiong.

MR. COMMISSIONG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I take your point and I am aware of the long-term complaints of systemic problems. And I don't say

that those complaints are not insignificant. They are complaints that any of the 22 or 2300 people in these facilities could make at this point, and they are institutional systemic issues, and they go into the mix of whether there are compelling circumstances here with respect to Mr. Limberatos. And so that's a long-winded way of saying I take your point about the general baseline level of sanitation being, as you say, bad. So you can go on.

MR. COMMISSIONG: No, your Honor. You were not long-winded. I think I was being long-winded and my apologies. And that's all I have for now, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Anything further, Mr. Sobelman?

MR. SOBELMAN: No, your Honor, unless there is something specific that you would like us to address.

THE COURT: Do you know anything about travel restrictions that would legally prohibit Mr. Limberatos from entering Greece?

MR. SOBELMAN: No, your Honor, we don't. It sounds like from what Mr. Commissiong said, and I think your Honor pointed out, Mr. Limberatos as a citizen would, of course, be permitted to enter his country. I don't know if he would have some kind of quarantine requirement upon entering.

I would also note, in terms of Greece being, quote unquote, an epicenter of the COVID-19 outbreak, it does not

bear out in the numbers. There are a total of 1800, approximately, confirmed cases in Greece according to the research I have conducted. They have approximately 180 cases per million citizens, as where the United States has about 1200 cases per million citizens.

Again, we really don't think it is necessary to create a serious draw for the defendant to want to be there, given the enormity of the sentence that he faces, the strength of the evidence, and the other reasons that we set forth in prior proceedings and this one that we think he is a substantial risk of flight, but to the extent the Court is considering the state of play in Greece with respect to COVID-19, we would just note those statistics.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Counsel, I have listened very carefully to everything that has been said here today, and I have read very carefully all of the prehearing submissions.

To the extent that Mr. Limberatos seeks general reopening of the detention hearing pursuant to Title 18, Section 3142(f) and reversal of the Court's prior determination that no condition or combination of conditions can provide adequate protection against the risk of flight, Mr. Limberatos has the burden of demonstrating that there is new information that has a material bearing on the issue of whether there are conditions of release that will reasonably assure Mr.

Limberatos's appearance as required. See Section 3142(f). Protection of the public was not an issue in the Court's prior detention determination and is not argued here. Under Section 3142(f), Mr. Limberatos has the burden of showing that there are new facts that are material to the risks that are the focus of the bail statute — risk of flight and risk of danger to the community.

Section 3142(i) provides that, where a detention order has been previously issued under Section 3142(e), a judicial officer may, by subsequent order, permit the temporary release of the person in the custody of a United States marshal or other appropriate person to the extent that the judicial officer determines such release to be necessary for preparation of the person's defense or for another compelling reason. Mr. Limberatos has the burden of showing that temporary release is warranted under Section 3142(i).

In October, the Court found that Mr. Limberatos presented a risk of flight against which no condition or combination of conditions could provide appropriate protection. This remains and is neither negated nor overcome by the health risks that COVID-19 admittedly creates for all members of our society, and especially for those detained in close quarters. The operation of our criminal justice system and the rule of law depend on successful management of personal and public risks both in ordinary times and in times like these of

emergency. Mr. Limberatos has failed to demonstrate in this application that there are conditions that can reasonably protect against the risk of flight presented by his Greek citizenship, the extradition policies of that country, and evidence of his access to financial resources and false identity documents, among other factors.

The Court has previously found that supervision and security bonds are insufficient to provide such protection, and the defendant's proffers of an extradition waiver that is likely unenforceable, a security package of higher monetary value, and acceptance of home detention are insufficient to mitigate the substantial risk of flight. The Court acknowledges that flight in this time of the COVID-19 pandemic would itself present additional infection risks to Mr.

Limberatos, but as between the potential consequences of a conviction and imposition of a penalty in this case and the possibility of being able to reach Greece and be insulated from those sorts of potential penalties, the Court is not persuaded that it is unlikely that a rational person might take that travel risk.

The ability of the Court to provide supervision is particularly challenged due to the public health emergency. No one in this city or country has absolute protection from the risk of contracting this terrible disease while enforcement officers and court supervision personnel are subjected to

exposure risks as they go about their public duties, and of course medical personnel are literally on the front lines. The Court does not take lightly the higher risk of exposure to the disease present within the MCC than in a location in which the person could be effectively and entirely separated from other people or have access to the most effective cleaning products. The BOP has, however, implemented policies and consulted with appropriate experts to develop and implement strategies to mitigate the risks posed by COVID-19 insofar as possible in the context of its facilities' resources and mission. The BOP's mitigation measures do not and cannot eliminate completely the risk of COVID-19, but these measures are calculated to mitigate the risk of infection in its inherently close quarters for all persons in custody and for BOP staff.

Although in certain cases the specific medical conditions of individual pretrial detainers may create risks so substantial that they reduce or outweigh the risk of flight posed by temporary release of such detainees, the Court finds that in Mr. Limberatos's case, particularly given the Greek extradition policies, the risk of flight presented by his release outweighs the risk of exposure to COVID-19 that he faces in detention, particularly where Mr. Limberatos is well under the age of 65, although the Court accepts that other public health authorities, including New York City, have indicated that there is at least some elevated risk over the

age of 50. Mr. Limberatos also has not demonstrated that his medical or physical condition makes him significantly more vulnerable to the disease than other detainees. Nor has Mr. Limberatos shown that he is subject to a particular threat to his ability ultimately to defend his case.

Therefore, the Court concludes that the COVID-19 pandemic does not present new facts material to Mr.

Limberatos's risk of flight under Section 3142(f) or a compelling reason under Section 3142(i) sufficient to justify his temporary release. The constitutional objection that Mr.

Limberatos has raised to his continued detention is also insufficient to meet the statutory standard as well as the constitutional standard.

The next status conference in this case has been adjourned in light of the current public health crisis and no substantive proceedings are imminent. And while the BOP has temporarily barred legal visits at the MCC, telephone privileges have been increased in light of the visiting restrictions and the BOP and the Court are working on putting in place facilities for video and teleconferencing with counsel. The government has proffered that the BOP will continue to permit teleconferencing with counsel and access to programs and services as permitted by the mitigation measures being taken which include the 14-day medical quarantine of detainees.

This is a fluid and evolving situation. This is		
clearly a situation in which the early development of defense		
strategies and attorney-client relationships is affected in a		
negative manner by the restrictions that have been put in place		
in response to the unprecedented, in our lifetimes, pandemic		
conditions here in the city and worldwide, but at all levels of		
government and society work is being done to mitigate the risks		
and return to a more open and more accessible life for all.		
And so in these emergency conditions, and given the relatively		
limited period of time that these conditions are expected to		
last, and the early stage of this case, the Court finds that		
the current situation does not present a Sixth Amendment		
violation or a compelling need for release to enable Mr.		
Limberatos to prepare his defense. Accordingly, Mr.		
Limberatos's application for release is denied and the Court		
will enter an order accordingly.		
Mr. Commissiong, will you describe today's proceedings		
to the defendant as soon as you can?		
MR. COMMISSIONG: Yes, I will do that, your Honor.		
THE COURT: And will you also order and provide a copy		
of the transcript of these proceedings to Mr. Limberatos? Of		
course, I will sign off on the authorization for that.		
MR. COMMISSIONG: Yes. Absolutely, your Honor.		

Counsel, I thank you for your advocacy and the level

1	of seriousness with which you have both taken the issues
2	presented today and the questions of Mr. Limberatos's welfare.
3	MR. COMMISSIONG: Thank you, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Is there anything else that we need to
5	take up together this afternoon?
6	MR. SOBELMAN: Nothing from the government.
7	MR. COMMISSIONG: Nothing from the defense, your
8	Honor.
9	THE COURT: Thank you, everyone. Keep safe and stay
10	well.
11	Thank you. We are adjourned.
12	(Adjourned)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	